DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 940 EA 025 172

AUTHOR Rinehart, James S.; Short, Paula M.
TITLE Job Satisfaction and Empowerment among Teacher Leaders, Reading Recovery Teachers, and Regular Classroom Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Participative Decision Making; *Quality of Working Life; School Restructuring; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that examined the relationships of the perceptions of teachers in three different teaching roles to a measure of empowerment and a measure of job satisfaction are presented in this paper. Methodology involved a survey of 35 Reading Recovery teacher leaders, 141 Reading Recovery teachers, and 71 non-Reading Recovery teachers. Multivariate analyses suggest that Reading Recovery teacher leaders perceive a greater sense of empowerment and job satisfaction than do Reading Recovery teachers and regular classroom teachers. Teacher leaders have more decision-making responsibilities in areas such as scheduling, budgeting, and curriculum and feel that they affect student learning. Creating school settings where participants experience greater empowerment may result in perceptions of greater job satisfaction. In turn, increased job satisfaction may enhance teacher performance, quality of working life, organizational effectiveness, and student performance. Five tables are included. (Contains 29 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 940

JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPOWERMENT AMONG TEACHER LEADERS, READING RECOVERY TEACHERS AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

James S. Rinehart
University of Kentucky

Paula M. Short
The Pennsylvania State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Rinehart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper to be presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association
Atlanta, GA, April, 1993

Running Head: JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPOWERMENT

EA025172

JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPOWERMENT AMONG TEACHER LEADERS, READING RECOVERY TEACHERS AND REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

Empowering teachers is a crucial part of school restructuring or reform efforts. When one considers projects such as the Coalition of Essential Schools (Sizer, 1984), the New Standards Project (Simmons & Resnick, 1993), site-based decision making in Chicago and Kentucky, or teacher involvement in developing standards (Alexander, 1993), it is evident that a expanded role of teacher involvement is required. Other projects have empowered teachers to be effective decision makers (Short, Greer, & Michael, 1991).

In the above endeavors, there is heavy emphasis on teacher involvement and input into the decision-making process. The expanded role for teachers has been conceptual to this point and little is know about the effect on teachers themselves. Empirical research (quantitative and qualitative) is needed to understand the emerging role of teachers and the resulting effects on those teachers.

Expanding on the empowerment theme, it would appear that a hierarchy of three tiers may exist. At the purest level, empowerment evolves at a grass roots level as teachers develop expertise in becoming problem solvers. Administrators recognize the importance of teacher involvement and encourage teachers to pursue a role involving decision making in areas such as instruction, budget, scheduling, etc..

At a second level, empowerment may develop through specialized programs that are incorporated into the school curriculum. Through the specialized programs, teachers gain knowledge, skill and develop a sense of self-efficacy, impact, or empowerment. An excellent example of programmatic empowerment is the Reading Recovery Program (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988). These types of programs may create organizations within organizations.

A third level of the empowerment hierarchy is mandated by school districts or state legislatures. This level appears to be a contradiction in that teachers are mandated to be involved in decision making. That is, a state legislature may decide to enact site-based decision making as in the Chicago School System or in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Thus, teachers find themselves unprepared and unready to assume a different role.

Regardless of the level of empowerment, additional knowledge is needed regarding the emerging role of teachers, especially the construct of empowerment. For example, in a study of the teachers in the project directed by Short et al. (1991), researchers found that an inverse relationship existed between the perception of empowerment and school climate (Short & Rinehart, 1992). These researchers concluded that as teachers are empowered, divergent beliefs and ideas are freely expressed resulting in increased levels of conflict which effects teachers' perception of climate. Short and Rinehart (1992) also indicated the need to explore other psychological aspects of school personnel as they restructure,

especially those restructuring efforts that incorporate the empowerment of teachers.

A psychological construct that has been studied in both the private and public sectors is job satisfaction. These studies have investigated the relationship of job satisfaction to job performance, quality of work life, or organizational effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1991) The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of the perceptions of teachers in three different teaching roles to a measure of empowerment and a measure of job satisfaction.

PERSPECTIVES

EMPOWERMENT

Empowerment is a dominant theme in all types of organizations including business, industry, and service organizations. Current interest in empowerment has filtered to school organizations and school participants (Maeroff, 1988;Lightfoot, 1986). Researchers as well as educational, political, and other public groups have advocated for the restructuring of public education and the empowerment of school staff members (Cuban, 1990; Farber & Miller, 1981; Maeroff, 1988). Empowerment is defined as the opportunities an individual has for autonomy, choice, responsibility, and participation in decision making in organizations (Lightfoot, 1986). Jenkins (1988) stated "To empower others is to give a stakeholder share in the movement and direction of the enterprise"(p. 149). Staff members who are able to initiate and carry out new ideas by involvement in decision making should, in turn, create enhanced learning opportunities for students (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Metz, 1983; Short & Greer, 1989). Traditionally, school-level personnel are excluded from critical decisions including personnel allocation and hiring, curriculum, budget allocations, and scheduling of teaching time (Zielinski, 1983).

School restructuring has, as one of its components, the empowerment of teachers, administrators, and students (Murphy, 1992; Short, Greer, & Michael, 1991; Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993). In fact, the restructuring paradigm of Murphy includes empowerment as an integral part of reform. Researchers have indicated that employee participation in decision making will result in increased organizational effectiveness (Lawler, 1986). Thus, a similar phenomenon should develop with the effectiveness of schools as teachers become involved in making decisions about the problems they face.

JOB SATISFACTION

Administrators in most organizations are interested in job satisfaction of their employees. This interest has been keyed by the belief that happy employees have higher performance levels. However, a debate over whether job satisfaction causes productivity or productivity causes job satisfaction has been a major theme pursued by researchers in both the private and public sector (Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985).

Research on job satisfaction began when Hoppock (1935) defined

job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, "I am satisfied with my job." Since that time, researchers have studied job satisfaction and the implications job satisfaction had for organizations and for individuals in organizations. In educational settings, for example, Lester (1988) reviewed the literature for the years 1975 through 1986 and found 1063 articles concerning job satisfaction and teaching.

Researchers investigating job satisfaction have attempted to study its relationship to demographics such as gender (Cano & Miller, 1992), absenteeism (Bridges, 1980), work environment (Conley, Bacharach, & Bauer, 1989), commitment and morale (Reyes & Imber, 1992), motivation (Frase & Sorenson, 1993) and school structure (Ratsoy, 1973; Miskel, Fevurly, & Stewart, 1979). The research on job satisfaction appears to be extensive but not complete as the introduction of restructuring efforts change an already complex educational setting. As noted above some of the recent studies are investigating relationships between job satisfaction and other psychological constructs such as motivation, morale, and commitment.

Specifically, some researchers have indicated that job satisfaction and school structure are important for those involved in restructuring efforts. Ratsoy (1973), for example, concluded that teacher job satisfaction is lower in schools where a high degree of bureaucracy is perceived. In another study, job satisfaction was found to increase when job expectations were clear (Miskel, Fevurly, and Stewart, 1979). Additionally, as the school organization becomes more open or participative, teacher job satisfaction tends to increase (Miskel, et al., 1979).

Relationships between job satisfaction and psychological constructs are also important for those involved in restructuring efforts. For example, Reyes & Imber (1992) found that fairness of workload is related to job satisfaction as well as commitment and morale. Billingsley & Cross (1992) indicated that leadership support, work involvement, and lower levels of role conflict are significantly associated with job satisfaction. Finally, Frase and Sorenson (1993) found that feedback from coworkers and supervisors, autonomy, and collegiality are related to job satisfaction. These studies investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and psychological constructs provide meaningful knowledge about the complex environment in which educators live.

The above studies add valuable information to the knowledge base about educators in school systems. As researchers study job satisfaction, there is a recent tendency to investigate psychological constructs which tend to be better predictors of job satisfaction than demographic variables (Billingsley & Cross, 1992). An important psychological variable in the reform movements is the empowerment of the school participants. Lacking at this point in time is empirical information regarding the relationship of participant empowerment and job satisfaction.

READING RECOVERY

Reading Recovery has become a well known program for "at risk" first grade students. Various studies have reported on the achievement level of these "at risk" first grade students (Pinnell, et al., 1988). However, little attention has been paid to the effects on teachers involved in delivering this program. These individuals can be classified into two categories: Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders and Reading Recovery Teachers.

Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders are trained and mentored for one year at one of five designated training sites. Upon completion of the training, they return to their home school to administer the program, to teach "at risk" students, and to train teachers selected to be Reading Recovery Teachers. In addition to planning the foregoing functions, the Teacher Leaders perform the following administrative duties: supervising the testing of children, write a yearly site research report, conducting information sessions for interested groups, and recruiting teachers for Reading Recovery training (Rinehart & Short, 1991).

Reading Recovery Teachers, on the other hand, spend a half day teaching Reading Recovery students and a half day with regular classroom assignments (Pinnell, et al., 1988). These teachers learn while on the job and attend meetings conducted by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader for continuing professional development. The professional development for these teachers is provided by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders and is based on the teacher leader training. The essential difference is that Reading Recovery Teachers learn at the home site while performing their duties as a classroom teacher.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

For many years, researchers have sought to account for the variance in teacher job satisfaction with other variables by investigating demographic characteristics, psychological variables, organizational structure, etc. An underlying hypothesis of these studies is the belief that when teachers are satisfied one of three factors will effected; their productivity will increase, their quality of work life will improve, or the organizational effectiveness will improve (Hoy, et al., 1991). Today, teacher roles are changing and the effects of these changes should be studied (Lester, 1988).

The questions guiding this study are:

1. What is the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher participation?
2. Are there differences among teachers in different roles on the constructs of empowerment and job satisfaction?

METHODOLOGY

PARTICIPANTS

A letter was written to each of the 167 Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders requesting their participation and cooperation. The teacher leaders were asked to respond to a demographic sheet, School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). In the letter, each teacher

leader was also requested to ask five Reading Recovery Teachers attending a Reading Recovery teachers' meeting to respond to the same instruments. Finally, the Teacher Leader was requested to supply the names and addresses of all principals in school systems served by the Teacher Leader. An addressed, stamped envelop was provided to return the instruments, demographic sheets, and principals' addresses. This mailing resulted in 35 usable forms from Teacher Leaders and 141 usable instruments from Reading Recovery Teachers.

From the list of principals supplied by the Teacher Leaders, a principal's name was selected at random from each of the lists. These principals were sent a letter asking them to have five teachers, must be a first grade teacher and a non-Reading Recovery teacher, attending a faculty meeting to respond to the demographic sheet, School Participant Empowerment Scale, and Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. An addressed, stamped envelop was provided to return the instruments demographic sheets. This mailing resulted in 71 usable instruments. These participants were considered the control group.

Tables 1 and 2 were compiled from the returned demographic sheets. Some participants chose not to answer some of the demographic items. From the compilations, the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders had an average age of 44.09 (standard deviation of 6.80) years, had taught for 19.7 (standard deviation of 5.79) years, and had 3.17 (standard deviation of 2.29) years of experience with Reading Recovery. They tended to be female, white, and had completed at least a Master's degree (one-third had a specialist degree).

The second group of interest, Reading Recovery Teachers, were 42.16 (standard deviation of 8.68) years of age, had taught for 15.88 (standard deviation of 8.54) years, and had 2.13 (standard deviation of 6.83) years of experience with Reading Recovery. These teachers also tended to be white and female. The majority of the teachers had at least a Master's or Specialist degree (see Tables 1 and 2).

The classroom teachers were, on the average, 39.05 (standard deviation of 8.26) years of age, had 14.16 (standard deviation of 7.92) years of teaching experience, and did not have any experience with Reading Recovery. They also tended to be white, have a bachelor's degree, and were female.

Insert Table 1 and 2 about here

In general, the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders were somewhat older, had more teaching experience, and had more experience with Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders and Reading Recovery Teachers tended to have participants with more Master's and Specialist degrees. In addition, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders and Reading Recovery Teachers had received training to

implement the Reading Recovery Program.

The above procedure resulted in instruments being returned from three groups of teachers (Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders, Reading Recovery Teachers, and regular classroom first grade teachers). These three groups of teachers form the qualitative independent variable (three different teacher roles). The classroom teacher group was a control group against which to gage the effects of empowerment on job satisfaction. These groups were formed with participants from schools with Reading Recovery Programs. Some randomness was utilized with the Reading Recovery Teachers and classroom teachers. The Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders, however, were an intact group.

INSTRUMENTS

Instruments used in this study were the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) and the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES). The first instrument (TJSQ) was developed by Lester (1987) and she used factor analysis to develop the 66 item instrument. Responses to the 66 items were collected using a 5-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). Approximately 50% of the items were written in a positive form and 50% were written in a negative form.

Lester (1987) identified nine factors that measure the perception teachers have of their job satisfaction. The nine factors and their corresponding internal consistency coefficients are: supervision (.92), colleagues (.82), working conditions (.83), pay (.80), responsibility (.73), work itself (.82), advancement (.81), security (.71), and recognition (.74) which accounted for 49.4% of the variance. Internal consistency for the overall TJSQ was .93.

In this study, four of the nine factors on the TJSQ were selected to gain participants' perceptions of certain aspects of job satisfaction. These factors were colleagues, responsibility, work itself, and recognition. In choosing these factors, the researchers believed these aspects of job satisfaction were important factors to consider when investigating teacher participation.

The second instrument utilized for this study was the SPES which was developed to measure teachers' perception of participation in school systems. Short and Rinehart (1992) developed this 38 item instrument utilizing a 5-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). There were 6 factors identified through factor analysis that explain teachers perception of empowerment. These factors and their internal consistency coefficients are: decision making (.89), professional growth (.83), status (.86), self-efficacy (.84), autonomy (.81), and impact (.82). For the total 38-item SPES, coefficient alpha was .94.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data were submitted to a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Pearson Product Moment Correlations were also calculated

during data analysis. The independent variable was the three different teacher roles: Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery Teacher, and classroom teacher. Both the Reading Recovery Teacher roles were viewed as treatment and the classroom teacher role as a control.

Univariate analysis (ANOVA) was used to follow-up a significant multivariate result. A significant univariate result was followed by Dunnett's post hoc test. This test was chosen because comparisons were being made to a control group (Keppel, 1991).

Dependent variables in this study were the total scores from the TJSQ and the SPES instruments. These instruments both used Likert-type scales ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Both instruments had high internal consistency estimates of .93 for the TJSQ and .94 for the SPES.

Because the sample size for each of the three levels of the independent variable were unequal and unproportional (35, 141, and 71), a computer sampling procedure was utilized so that equal sample sizes were realized. This procedure is suggested to avoid violating statistical assumptions when unequal sample sizes are not due to psychological sources (Keppel, 1991). Following the computer sampling procedure, each group of participants contained 35 individuals with usable scores (no item was unanswered).

RESULTS

Data were analyzed utilizing multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and Pearson Product Moment Correlations. For the MANOVA statistic, the independent variable was teacher role (Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery Teacher, and regular classroom teacher) and the dependent variables were teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to estimate the relationship between certain aspects of teacher job satisfaction and teacher empowerment.

Internal consistency measures were calculated for the SPES and for the four subscales of the TJSQ. As estimated by coefficient alpha, the overall measure of internal consistency for the SPES was .93. The subscales of the SPES, decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact, had internal consistency estimates of .85, .81, .81, .79, .69, and .71, respectively.

For the four subscales of TJSQ, a composite was formed and an internal consistency measure (coefficient alpha) was calculated to be .87. Internal consistency measures of the four subscales, colleagues, responsible, work itself, and recognition, were calculated to be .80, .69, .67, and .77, respectively.

The correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and participant empowerment was calculated. This calculation resulted in a coefficient of $r=.73$ ($p=.000$) which would have a common variance (coefficient of determination) of 53%. Accounting for this much variance between job satisfaction is impressive and an improvement over previous relationships between job satisfaction and other variables of interest.

Results of the MANOVA analysis (see Table 3) indicated a significant Wilks Lambda (WL=.7966; F=6.08, p=.000). The univariate results revealed a statistically significant result for teacher job satisfaction (F=3.39, p=.038) and a statistically significant result for teacher empowerment (F=12.12, p=.000).

Insert Table 3 about here

Means for each of the three groups on the dependent variables of SPES and TJSQ are found in Table 4. On the SPES, the means were 133.74 (8.69), 127.91 (12.54), and 127.72 (11.44) for Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery Teacher, and classroom teacher, respectively. For the variable TJSQ, means were 164.77 (14.12), 149.34 (14.94), and 147.54 (18.82) for Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery Teacher, and classroom teacher, respectively.

Insert Table 4 about here

Dunnett's post hoc test of the School Participant Empowerment Scale means revealed that the Teacher Leaders' (mean = 164.77) perceptions were significantly different from the Reading Recovery Teachers' (mean = 149.34) perceptions and the regular classroom teachers' (mean = 147.54) perceptions, but there were no significant differences between perceptions of Reading Recovery Teachers and regular classroom teachers.

Similarly, Dunnett's test on the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire indicated that Teacher Leader's (mean = 133.74) perceptions were statistically different from Reading Recovery Teacher's (mean = 127.91) perceptions and the regular classroom teacher's (127.71) perceptions, but there were no significant differences between Reading Recovery Teachers and classroom teachers.

Insert Table 5 about here

These results suggest that Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders perceive a greater sense of empowerment and satisfaction than either Reading Recovery Teachers or regular classroom teachers. This may be explained by the fact that Teacher Leaders have more decision making responsibilities in areas such as scheduling, budgeting, curriculum, etc. and feel that they have an impact on student learning in their role.

EXPLANATIONS

Question one concerned the relationship between job satisfaction and participant empowerment. The correlation (r=.73,

p=.000) and common variance (53%) indicate a statistically significant as well as a practically significant result. Attempts to predict job satisfaction have traditionally focused on demographic variables. However, in this study, the psychological construct of participant empowerment had a strong and positive relationship to job satisfaction.

In question two, differences between three teacher roles and the constructs of job satisfaction and participant empowerment was analyzed. Statistical analysis indicated that differences did exist; and, more specifically, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders were more satisfied and felt more empowered than either Reading Recovery Teachers or classroom teachers. These results are interesting and lend insight to the construct of job satisfaction and participant empowerment.

Results of the data analysis for question two may be due to one of three reasons or a combination of these reasons. First, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders spend a year mastering teaching strategies and implementation of these strategies before returning to a school district to implement the Reading Recovery Program. This gives the teachers time to digest and practice additional expertise which classroom teachers do not receive. The additional time for training may enhance the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader's perception of both job satisfaction and participant empowerment.

Second, upon returning to a school district, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders have more voice over the scheduling of their own time. In addition, they have reported increased involvement in various decision making functions such as program scheduling, program budgeting, selection of teachers, etc. (Rinehart & Short, 1991). In other words, the work design is more open to the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders which may have influenced their perception of job satisfaction (Miskel, et al., 1979) as well as empowerment. Classroom teachers and Reading Recovery Teachers, on the other hand, may see themselves as still constrained by the bureaucracy which is followed by a lower perception of job satisfaction (Ratsoy, 1973) as well as participant empowerment.

Finally, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders have reported a belief of enhanced understanding of the reading process (knowledge) and a belief that they are making a difference in the learning of at-risk children (Rinehart & Short, 1991). Not only are they aware of their increased knowledge and impact, but also they are in positions to receive the initial feedback from their supervisors which may increase their feelings of job satisfaction (Frase & Sorenson, 1993) and participant empowerment. Reading Recovery Teachers and classroom teachers may not receive the same kind of recognition for their work even though they may be having a similar impact.

The above explanations are an attempt to understand the analysis of data obtained in this study. Although there may be other plausible explanations, the importance of this study is found from the implications that may be derived. Additionally, an extremely important finding was accounting for the large amount of

variance between job satisfaction and participant empowerment.

IMPLICATIONS

This study suggests that creating school settings (schools or programs) where participants experience greater empowerment (decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact) may result in perceptions of greater job satisfaction (colleagues, responsibility, work itself, and recognition). In particular, results of the data analysis indicated that Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders perceived themselves to be more empowered than the Reading Recovery Teachers or the classroom teachers. At the same time, Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders perceived themselves to be more satisfied with their role than Reading Recovery Teachers or classroom teachers. These findings may have implications for policy makers and administrators as they determine goals and objectives for secondary schools.

Restructuring efforts, such as the Reading Recovery Program, have empowered teachers by developing the teachers' expertise and instructional skills. This programmatic approach requires that the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader receive training that consists of coursework and mentoring that takes a year to complete. It may be that the year-long training and mentoring not only increases the perception of empowerment, but also increases the perception of job satisfaction. These results are important for policy makers as they have a tendency to overlook the importance of time to train teachers and to change thinking frameworks.

Concern for increasing job satisfaction may have an effect on either teacher performance, quality of work life, or organizational effectiveness (Hoy, et al., 1991). First, there is some evidence that suggests satisfied employees are more productive employees than unsatisfied employees (Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984). It is a documented fact that Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders not only work successfully with at-risk students (Pinnell, et al. 1988), but they also have job descriptions that include many more duties than classroom teachers (Rinehart, et al., 1991). Evidence from this study suggests that increasing job satisfaction does increase productivity.

Second, it has been documented that implementation of the Reading Recovery Program has increased the reading and writing strategies of at- risk first grade students (Pinnell, et al., 1988). As reading and writing strategies for these at-risk students improve, achievement in other content areas should also improve. As individual students improve, the overall effectiveness of the school system increases. This reasoning also supports the importance of job satisfaction in school settings.

Finally, as job satisfaction and participant empowerment increase, the quality of work life should also increase. Individuals who are involved in the decision making process and have opportunities to influence their work design take greater pride in their work and the product they produce.

The essence of the study concerns the level of participant

empowerment that teachers have in restructuring efforts. If the relationships between participant empowerment and job satisfaction hold for other studies and if the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity are accurate, then teachers need to be included as decision makers in restructuring efforts. It is also advisable to give teachers time for professional development to develop teaching skills as well as to develop consensus building skills, brainstorming skills, and skills to handle conflict.

This study, as with all studies, has limitations that indicate the results should be interpreted with caution. A limitation in this study is the sample drawn from the population of Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders. Approximately 21% of the teacher leaders participated in the study. Generalizing these results to all Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders or to other programmatic trained teachers is tenuous and should be done with caution. However, the evidence does point to the perception that educators need professional development similar to that received by employees in the private sector.

Another limitation may also exist with the Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders. These individuals may have to leave home and family for a year of training and mentoring. Individuals who will take that risk may have different psychological make-ups than teachers who do not choose to leave family and home to receive additional professional development. This may suggest to administrators the possibility of seeking risk takers to assist in restructuring efforts.

Future research should continue to be conducted with teachers and the construct of empowerment. Additional knowledge may assist policy makers during reform and restructuring efforts. For example, do teachers who seek additional professional development also seek increased levels of empowerment and autonomy? Does increasing empowerment increase conflict in the school? Do empowered teachers become committed teachers? Finally, does empowering teachers increase motivational levels? Answers to these and other questions would increase the knowledge base about empowering individuals in organizations.

References

Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators. The journal of special education, 25(4), 453-471.

Bridges, E. M. (Spring,1980). Job satisfaction and teacher absenteeism. Educational administration quarterly, 16(2), 41-56.

Cano, J., & Miller, G., (Fall, 1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agricultural education teachers. Journal of agricultural education, 33(3), 40-46.

Conley, S. C., Bacharach, S. B., & Bauer, S. (February, 1989). The school work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. Educational administration quarterly, 25(1), 58-81.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-13.

Farber, B. A., & Miller, J. (1981). Teacher burnout: A psycholoeducational perspective. Teachers College Press, 83, 235-245.

Frase, L. E., & Sorenson, L. (January, 1992). Teacher motivation and satisfaction: Impact on participatory management. NASSP Bulletin, 76(540), 37-43.

Hoppick, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C., G. (1991). Educational administration: Theory, research, practice, 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin, 97(2), 251-273.

Jenkins, K. (1988). Metaphor and mindset for educational leadership. The Educational Forum, 52(2), 143-151.

Keppel, G. (1991). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Lawler, E. E. (1986). High involvement-management: Participative strategies for imporving organizational performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lester, P. E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47(1), 223-233.

Lester, P. E. (1988). Teacher job satisfaction: An annotated bibliography and guide to research. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world and their work: Implications for school improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness of schools: Themes of empowerment. Peabody Journal of Education, 63(3), 9-28.

Maeroff, G. I. (1986). A blue for empowering teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(71), 472-477.

Miskel, C. G., Fevurly, R., & Stewart, J. (Fall, 1979). Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. Educational administration quarterly, 15(3), 97-118.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the Phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. Academy of management review, 9(4), 712-721.

Pinnell, G. S., DeFord, D. E., & Lyons, C. A. (1988). Reading recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders (Educational Research Service Monograph). Arlington Virginia: Educational Research Service.

Ratsoy, E. W. (1973). Participative and hierarchical management of schools: Some emerging generalizations. Journal of educational administration, 11, 161-170.

Reyes, P., & Imber, M. (1992). Teachers' perceptions of the fairness of their workload and their commitment, job satisfaction, and morale: Implications for teacher evaluation. Journal of personnel evaluation in education, (5), 291-302.

Rinehart, J. S. & Short, P. M. (1991). Viewing reading recovery as a restructuring phenomenon. The Journal of School Leadership, 1(4), 379-399.

Ross, D. D., Bondy, E., & Kyle, D. W. (1993). Reflective teaching for student empowerment. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1989). Increasing teacher autonomy through shared governance: Effects on policy making and student outcomes. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, 1989.

Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., & Michael, R. (1991). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 1991.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52, 951-960.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations[1] of Study Participants for Age, Teaching Experience, Reading Recovery Experience

	Mean	N
Age		
RR Teacher Leader	44.09 (6.80)	35
RR Teacher	42.16 (8.68)	186
Teacher	39.05 (8.26)	84
All Participants	41.52 (8.51)	305
Teaching Experience		
RR Teacher Leader	19.70 (5.79)	37
RR Teacher	15.88 (8.54)	193
Teacher	14.16 (7.92)	88
All Participants	15.85 (8.23)	318
Reading Recovery Experience		
RR Teacher Leader	3.17 (2.29)	35
RR Teacher	2.13 (6.83)	193
All Participants[2]	2.29 (6.36)	228

[1] Standard deviations are in parenthesis
[2] Some participants chose not to answer all of the demographic variables, therefore, some totals are less than 305.

Table 2

Frequencies for Gender, Highest Held Degree, Race, and Type of School

	Frequency			
Variable	Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	Reading Recovery Teacher	Classroom Teacher	Total
Gender				
Female	38	183	82	
Male	0	7	4	
All Participants	38	190	86	314
Degree				
Bachelor	43	36		
Bachelor + 30	3	18	14	
Master	21	97	33	
Specialist	13	30	5	
Doctorate	1			
All Participants	38	188	88	314
Race				
Hispanic	2	10	3	
Black	1	11	3	
White	34	165	80	
American Native	0	3	0	
Asian	0	2	0	
All Participants	37	191	86	314
Type of School				
Urban	12	71	22	
Suburban	11	50	29	
Small	2	22	5	
Rural	12	43	29	
All Participants	37	186	85	308

Table 3

Univariate Analysis of Variance Test Results and Multivariate Test Results for the Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale and School Participant Empowerment Scale

Dependent Variable - Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale

Source	DF	SS	MS	F-Value	p
Teacher Role	2	820.82	410.41	3.39	.038
Error	102	12362.57	121.20		

Dependent Variable - School Participant Empowerment Scale

Source	DF	SS	MS	F-Value	p
Teacher Role	2	6277.89	3138.94	12.12	.000
Error	102	26406.74	258.89		

Multivariate Test

Source	DF	F-Value	p	Wilkes Lambda
Teacher Role	4	6.08	.000	.7966
Error	204			

Table 4

Means and standard deviations for Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale and School Participant Empowerment Scale

Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale

Teacher Role	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	133.74	8.69	35
Reading Recovery Teacher	127.91	12.54	35
Classroom Teacher	127.71	11.44	35
All Participants	129.79	11.26	105

School Participant Empowerment Scale

Teacher Role	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	164.77	14.12	35
Reading Recovery Teacher	149.34	14.94	35
Classroom Teacher	147.54	18.82	35
All Participants	153.89	17.73	105

Table 5

Results of Dunnett's Post Hoc Test on the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire for the Teaching Roles of Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery Teacher, and Classroom Teacher

	School Participant Empowerment Scale			
		A	B	C
(A) Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	164.77	-	15.43*	17.23*
(B) Reading Recovery Teacher	149.34		-	1.80
(C) Classroom Teacher	147.54			-

	Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire			
		A	B	C
(A) Reading Recovery Teacher Leader	133.74	-	5.83*	6.03*
(B) Reading Recovery Teacher	127.91		-	0.20
(C) Classroom Teacher	127.71			-